



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/079,494                       | 02/22/2002  | Kanji Hata           | 2002_0244           | 2630             |
| 513                              | 7590        | 04/15/2005           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. |             |                      | NGUYEN, DONGHAI D   |                  |
| 2033 K STREET N. W.              |             |                      |                     |                  |
| SUITE 800                        |             |                      | ART UNIT            |                  |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021        |             |                      | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
|                                  |             |                      | 3729                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                          |                                      |                                    |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/079,494 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>HATA ET AL. |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b><br>Donghai D. Nguyen | <b>Art Unit</b><br>3729            |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Donghai D. Nguyen. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Joseph Gorski. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 12 April 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-12 and 25-56.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**A. DEXTER TUGBANG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Gorski argues that the restriction between apparatus claims and method claims is improper. The Examiner provides the explanations that the restriction between the method and apparatus are proper for the reasons provided in the Office Action mailed on 2/18/05 and an additional reason such as the method as claimed can be practiced by hand. The Examiner's position is that the inventions of Group I and II are still considered to be distinct and independent, pursuant to MPEP\$ 806.05 (e), for the reasons discussed above, and being that only one-way distinctness is required between Group I and Group II .